## For the Northern District of California

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8			
9			
10	LUMASCAPE USA, INC., a California corporation,		
11	LUMASCAPE INDUSTRIES (PTY), LTD., an Australian corporation, and MICHAEL AGUSTIN,	No. C 05-04809 WHA	
12	an individual,		
13	Plaintiffs,	REMINDER NOTICE	
14	V. VEDTEV I ICUTING INC. a Quahaa comparation	OF UPCOMING TRIAL AND FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE	
15 16	VERTEX LIGHTING, INC., a Quebec corporation, FABRICE PELLEGRINO, an individual, DANIEL MERCILLE, an individual, and MICHAEL SANSCARTIER, an individual,	CONFERENCE	
17	Defendants.		
18	/		
19	This notice serves as a friendly reminder that this case remains set for a FINAL		
20	PRETRIAL CONFERENCE on JANUARY 29, 2007, at 2:00 P.M., with a TRIAL on		
21	FEBRUARY 12, 2007. Please consult the existing case management order and review and		
22	follow all standing guidelines and orders of the undersigned for civil cases on the Court's		
23	website at http://www.cand.uscourts.gov. Continuances will rarely be granted.		
24	The final pretrial conference will be an important event, for it will be there that the		
25	shape of the upcoming trial will be determined, including in limine orders, time limits and		
26	exhibit mechanics. Lead trial counsel must attend.		
27	To avoid any misunderstanding with respect to the final pro-	etrial conference and trial,	

the Court wishes to emphasize that all filings and appearances must be made — on pain of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

dismissal, default or other sanction — unless and until a dismissal fully resolving the case is
received. It will not be enough to inform the clerk that a settlement in principle has been
reached or to lodge a partially executed settlement agreement or to lodge a fully executed
agreement (or dismissal) that resolves less than the entire case. Where, however, a
fully-executed and unconditional settlement agreement clearly and fully disposing of the entire
case is lodged reasonably in advance of the pretrial conference or trial and only a ministerial
act remains, the Court will arrange a telephone conference to work out an alternate procedure
pending a formal dismissal.

In order to evaluate whether the Court can be of further ADR assistance, please file a joint report within fourteen days of service of this order describing the progress and status of your ADR efforts to date and any further ADR recommendations by the parties.

In this case, the Court wishes to consider the following additional trial procedures and desires that counsel meet and confer and reach a stipulation concerning whether and how to use them:

- Scheduling opposing experts so as to appear in successive order; 1.
- 2. Giving preliminary instructions on the law;
- 3. Allowing limited pre-closing deliberations (as per, e.g., Rule 39 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure); and
- 4. Allowing each side fifteen minutes of opening/argument time to be used during the evidence time (in addition to normal opening statement and closing argument).

Please present the results of your stipulation (or not) in the joint pretrial conference submissions.

24

25

26

Dated: December 8, 2006.

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE